

No. 11(112)-80-8Lab./11933.—In pursuance of the provision of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Faridabad, in respect of the dispute between the workmen and the management of M/s Delight Engineering Works, Plot No. 386, Sector-24, Faridabad.

IN THE COURT OF SHRI ISHWAR PRASAD CHAUDHRY, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT, HARYANA, FARIDABAD.

Reference No. 406 of 1980

between

SHRI GIRRAJ SINGH, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S DELIGHT ENGINEERING WORKS, PLOT NO. 386, SECTOR-24, FARIDABAD.

Present:

Shri Sunehari Lal, for the workman along with workman.

Shri H. R. Dua, for the respondent-management.

AWARD

This reference No. 406 of 1980 has been referred to this Court by the Hon'ble Governor of Haryana,—vide his order No. ID/FD/89-80/44422, dated 19th August, 1980, under section 10(i)(c) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, for adjudication of the dispute existing between Shri Girraj Singh, workman and management of M/s Delight Engineering Works, Plot No. 386, Sector-24, Faridabad. The terms of the reference was :—

“Whether the termination of services of Shri Girraj Singh was justified and in order. If not, to what relief is he entitled ?

After receiving this reference notices were issued to both the parties for 11th September, 1980. On that day the management sent a telegramme for adjournment which was allowed and the case was fixed for 23rd September, 1980. On 23rd September, 1980, the workman filed his claim statement and the management filed its written statement on 30th September, 1980 and the case was fixed for 9th October, 1980. On that

day the workman made a statement before this Court that he had settled his dispute with the management and according to which he had received Rs. 2,000 (Rs. Two thousand only) in full and final settlement of all his claim before this court. He further stated that he had also foregone his right of reinstatement/re-employment. Now no dispute was pending between the parties.

This statement of the workman was also agreed to by the Shri Satish Kumar Arora, Proprietor of the company. He further stated that the management had settled the dispute with the workmen and had paid Rs. 2,000 before this court in full and final settlement of all the claim of the workman.

In the light of the above statement made by the parties, I hold that the demand raised by the workman against the management leading to this reference has been duly satisfied. There is now no dispute remains to be adjudicated upon between the parties.

This be read in answer to this reference. No order as to costs.

Dated the 9th October, 1980.

ISHWAR PRASAD CHAUDHRY,
Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana,
Faridabad.

Endorsement No. 1966, dated 27th October, 1980.

Forwarded, (four copies), to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Department, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

ISHWAR PRASAD CHAUDHRY,
Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana,
Faridabad.

No. 11(112)-80-8Lab./11997.—In pursuance of the provision of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court Faridabad, in respect of the dispute between the workmen and the management of M/s Gurbachan Singh. S/o Shri Mohan Singh Ka Factory, Gomti, Mohalla, Jagadhri.

IN THE COURT OF SHRI ISHWAR PRASAD CHAUDHRY, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT, HARYANA, FARIDABAD.

Reference No. 311 of 1980

between

SHRI RAM LAKHAN SINGH, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S GURBACHAN SINGH, S/O SHRI MOHAN SINGH KA FACTORY, GOMTI MOHALLA, JAGADHRI.

Present:

None, for the parties.

AWARD

This reference No. 311 of 1980 has been referred to this court by the Hon'ble Governor of Haryana,—vide his order No. ID/YMN/146-80/39534, dated 31st July, 1980, under section 10(i)(c) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, for adjudication of the dispute existing between Shri Ram Lakhan Singh, workman and the management of M/s Gurbachan Singh, S/o Shri Mohan Singh Ka Factory, Gomti Mohalla, Jagadhri. The term of the reference was :—

Whether the termination of services of Shri Ram Lakhan Singh, was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?

After receiving this reference notices were issued to the parties for 19th August, 1980, for Ambala Cantt., in the office of the Labour Officer-cum-Conciliation Officer, Ambala Cantt. On that day Shri Ashwani Kumar appeared on behalf of the workman without authority letter and he undertook to file the authority letter on the next date of hearing. On the other hand the notice sent to the management had not been served and the case was fixed for 16th September, 1980, for Ambala Cantt. Then the notice was again sent under Regd. A.D. to the management for 16th September, 1980, but on that day none was present for both the parties. The workman had already been served. Whereas the respondent has refused the service of the notice sent under Regd. post. It was already 1-30 p.m. The case had been called thrice.

In these circumstances, it was felt that the workman was not interested in

persuing his reference. Hence the case was dismissed in default. I send no dispute award in this reference. No order as to costs. This is read in answer of this reference.

Dated the 28th October, 1980.

ISHWAR PRASAD CHAUDHRY,
Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana,
Faridabad.

Endorsement No. 2047, dated 28th October, 1980.

Forwarded, (four copies), to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Department, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, with the request that the receipt of the above said award may please be acknowledge with in week's time.

ISHWAR PRASAD CHAUDHRY,
Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana,
Faridabad.

No. 11(112)-80-8Lab/11999.—In pursuance of the provision of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Faridabad, in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s Dasonda Singh-Waryam Singh, Saharanpur Road, Yamuna Nagar.

IN THE COURT OF SHRI ISHWAR PRASAD CHAUDHRY, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT, HARYANA, FARIDABAD.

Reference No. 368 of 1980

between

SHRI HAZARI SINGH, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S DASONDA SINGH-WARYAM SINGH, SAHARANPUR ROAD, YAMUNA NAGAR.

Present:

None for the parties.

AWARD

1. This reference No. 368 of 1980 has been referred to this court by the Hon'ble Governor of Haryana,—vide his order No. ID/YMN/145-80/40171, dated 5th

August, 1980, under section 10(1)(c) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, for adjudication of the dispute existing between Shri Hazari Singh, workman and the management of M/s Dasonda Singh-Waryam Singh, Saharanput Road, Yamuna Nagar. The term of the reference was:—

Whether the termination of services of Shri Hazari Singh was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?

After receiving this reference notices were issued to the parties for 19th August, 1980 for Ambala Cantt, but none was present for both the parties. Then the notices were again sent under Regd. A.D. to the parties for 16th September, 1980 for Ambala Cantt in the office of the Labour Officer-cum-Conciliation Officer, Ambala Cantt, but on that day also none was present for both the parties. The workman had already been served. Whereas the respondent-management has refused the service of the notice sent under Regd. post. It was already 12.30 P.M. The case had been called thrice. In these circumstances, it is felt that the workman is not interested in pursuing his reference. Hence the case was dismissed in default. I send no dispute award in this reference. No order as to costs. This be read in answer of this reference.

The 28th October, 1980.

ISHWAR PRASAD CHAUDHRY,
Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana,
Faridabad.

Endorsement No. 2046, dated 28th October, 1980.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, with the request that the receipt of the above-said award may please be acknowledged within week's time.

ISHWAR PRASAD CHAUDHRY,
Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana,
Faridabad.

The 28th October, 1980.

No. 11(112)-80-8Lab/12000.—In pursuance of the provision of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Faridabad, in respect of the dispute between the workmen and the management of M/s Himalayan Enterprises Metal Works, Jagadhri:—

IN THE COURT OF SHRI ISHWAR
PRASAD CHAUDHRY,
PRESIDING OFFICER,
LABOUR COURT, HARYANA,
FARIDABAD

Reference No. 305 of 1980

between

SHRI MEHAR CHAND. WORKMAN
AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S
HIMALAYAN ENTERPRISES METAL
WORKS, JAGADHRI.

Present:

None for the workman.

Shri Subhash Chander for the
management.

AWARD

This reference No. 305 of 1980 has been referred to this court by the Hon'ble Governor of Haryana.—vide his order No. ID/YMN/123-80/30256, dated 22nd July, 1980, under section 10(1)(c) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 for adjudication of the dispute existing between Shri Mehar Chand. workman and the management of M/s Himalayan Enterprises Metal Works, Jagadhri. The term of the reference was:—

Whether the termination of services of Shri Mehar Chand was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?

After receiving this reference notices were issued to both the parties for 19th August, 1980 for Ambala Cantt, in the office of the Labour Officer-cum-Conciliation Officer, Ambala Cantt. On that day, the representative of the management was present but neither the workman nor his authorised representative were present. Notice to the workman had been served. It was already 12-30 P.M. I held the *ex parte* proceedings against the workman and the case was fixed for the *ex parte* evidence of the management for 16th September, 1980 for Ambala Cantt. On that day

the management examined Shri Anil Goel, Partner of the respondent Company as MW-1, who stated that Shri Mehar Chand, workman, was working on Sharing Machine in the respondent Company. This workman absented himself from duty without signing any reason from 26th November, 1979 and he did not report for duty till 31st March, 1980. Then he had taken his full and final account of Rs. 350 from the respondent. The photo copies of this accounts are Exhibit M-2 and M-3. The photo copy of settlement is Exhibit M-1.

In view of the un-rebutted *ex parte* evidence produced by the management, I am left with no choice except to believe the version of the management. Over and above this my findings get support from the absenting of the workman in these proceedings in this court in this reference. I feel that the workman had settled his disputes with the respondent-management and no claim is made out of the workman against the management. The workman is not entitled to any relief. I give my award accordingly. No order as to costs. This may be read in answer to this reference.

The 28th October, 1980-

ISHWAR PRASAD CHAUDHRY,
Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana,
Faridabad.

Endorsement No. 2045, dated 28th October, 1980.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, with the request that the receipt of the above-said award may please be acknowledge within week's time.

ISHWAR PRASAD CHAUDHRY,
Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana,
Faridabad.

The 25th November, 1980

No. 11(112)-80-Lab/12001.—In pursuance of the provision of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court,

Faridabad, in respect of the dispute between the workmen and the management of M/s Babu Lal Saw Mills, near Government School, Surai Khoja, Faridabad:—

H. L. GUGNANI,

Secretary to Government, Haryana,
Labour and Employment Department,
IN THE COURT OF SHRI ISHWAR
PRASAD CHAUDHRY,
PRESIDING OFFICER,
LABOUR COURT, HARYANA,
FARIDABAD.

Reference No. 93 of 1980

between

SHRI LALAN PARSHAD, WORKMAN
AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S
BABU LAL SAW MILLS, NEAR
GOVERNMENT SCHOOL, SYRAI
KHOJA, FARIDABAD.

Present:

Workman with Shri Roshan Lal.

None for the respondent-management.

AWARD

This reference No. 93 of 1980 has been referred to this court by the Hon'ble Governor of Haryana,—*vide* his order No. ID/FD/13-80/9694, dated 25th February, 1980, under section 10(1)(c) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 for adjudication of the dispute existing between Shri Lalan Parshad, workman and the management of M/s Babu Lal Saw Mills, near Government School, Syrai Khoja, Faridabad. The term of the reference was:—

Whether the termination of services of Shri Lalan Parshad was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?

After receiving this reference notices were issued to both the parties. The management had refused to accept the notice of this court, so I proceeded *ex parte* against the management and the case was fixed for recording of *ex parte* evidence of the workman for 23rd July, 1980.

On 23rd July, 1980, Shri Lalan Parshad, workman concerned examined himself as WW-1, and stated that he was working as a helper with the respondent-management. The workman stated that he was drawing salary Rs. 250 per month. The management had not given him any appointment letter at the time of appointment. The workman further stated that on 15th November, 1979, he met with an accident and after that the management

terminated his service from 16th November, 1979 without assigning any reason. He further prayed that he be reinstated with full back wages and continuity of service.

Keeping in view, the circumstances of the case, I see no reason why the un-rebutted statement given on oath by the workman should not be believed especially when the management chose not to appear and defend this reference before this court. So I believing the un-rebutted statement of the workman, hold that the termination of the services of the workman was unjustified and not in order. He is entitled to be reinstated with full back wages and continuity of service.

This be read in answer to this reference. No order as to costs.
The 28th October, 1980.

ISHWAR PRASAD CHAUDHRY,
Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana,
Faridabad.

Endorsement No. 2044, dated 28th October, 1980.

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Department, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

ISHWAR PRASAD CHAUDHRY,
Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana,
Faridabad.

The 2nd January, 1981

No. 11(112)-80-8Lab./14070.—In pursuance of the provision of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Rohtak in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s Haryana Roadways, Bhiwani.

BEFORE SHRI BANWARI LAL DALAL, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT,
HARYANA, ROHTAK

Reference No. 48 of 1979

between

SHRI SATNAM SINGH, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S HARYANA
ROADWAYS BHIWANI

Present :—

Shri S. N. Vats alongwith the workman.

Shri Vijay Vir Singh, for the management.

AWARD

This reference No. 48 of 1979 has been referred to this Court by the Hon'ble Governor,— vide his order No. HSR/34-78/10.148, dated 3rd March, 1979 under section (10)(i)(c) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, for adjudication of the dispute existing between Shri Satnam Singh, workman and the management of M/s Haryana Roadways, Bhiwani. The term of the reference was :—

“Whether the termination of services of Shri Satnam Singh is justified and in order? If not, to what relief he is entitled?”

On the receipt of the order of reference notices as usual were sent to the parties who appeared in response to the same on 3rd April, 1979. The parties filed their respective pleadings on the basis of which issues were framed. The management was asked to lead their evidence first the same was recorded on 6th November, 1979, partly and the case was again fixed for remaining evidence of the management to be recorded on 4th January, 1980. Evidence of management was closed on 6th January, 1980. Again on 7th February, 1980 the management was afforded one more opportunity to adduce their remaining evidence on 5th March, 1980 when the same was recorded and closed on the same date. Workman evidence was recorded and closed on 2nd June, 1980. After obtaining several adjournments for arguments the parties reached an amicable settlement between themselves on 3rd December, 1980 and the statements of the parties were recorded as under :—

Statement of Shri Vijay Vir Singh, representative of the management :—

"The management offers to reinstate the workman with continuity of service, with all the benefits attached to the post which he was holding at the time of his termination with back wages for one and a half year from the date of termination, i. e. 21st March, 1975, onwards. The remaining period shall be treated as leave without pay."

Statement of Shri Satnam Singh, workman, in person :—

"I have heard the statement of the authorised representative of the management and accept the offer in toto. Award may be made accordingly."

In view of his statement no further proceedings are called for. Reference is answered and returned accordingly.

Dated the 5th December, 1980.

BANWARI LAL DALAL,
Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana,
Rohtak.

Endorsement No. 2905, dated the 20th December, 1980

Forwarded (four copies) to the Secretary to Government of Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act,

BANWARI LAL DALAL,
Presiding Officer,
Labour Court, Haryana,
Rohtak.
H. L. GUGNANI, Secy.

**PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT
BUILDINGS & ROADS BRANCH**

Circle Ambala
The 9th January, 1981

No. S.E./P.W.D./B&R./Ambala/1252.—Whereas it appears to the Governor of Haryana that land is likely to be needed by the Government at public expenses, for a public purpose, constructing a link road from Bari Pabni Sarawan road to Maheshwari in Ambala District, it is hereby notified that land described in the specification below is acquired for the above purpose.

This notification is made under the provisions of section 4 of the Land Acquisition Act, 1894, to all whom it may concern.

In exercise of the powers conferred by the aforesaid section, the Governor of Haryana is pleased to authorise the officers for the time being engaged in the undertaking with their servants and workmen to enter upon and survey any land in the locality and do all other acts required or permitted by that section.

Any person interested in the above land who has any objection to the acquisition thereof, may within thirty days after the date on which public notice of the substance of this notification is given in the locality file an objection in writing before the Land Acquisition Collector, Public Works Department, Building and Roads Branch, Ambala Cantt.

SPECIFICATION

District	Tehsil	Locality/ Village	Hadbast No.	Area in Acres	Khasra Nos.
Ambala	Jagadhri	Habitpur	271	1.33	70
					21/2, 22, 23, 24, 25/1
					71 73
					25 4, 5/1, 5/2
					74
					1/1, 1/2, 2, 3, 4, 5/1, 5/2

(Sd.)
Superintending Engineer,
Ambala Circle, P.W.D., B. & R. Branch,
Ambala Cantt.